

DISCUSSION OF THE AMENDMENTS

Claims 1-7, 15 and 16 are currently amended.

Claims 8-14 and 17-25 are withdrawn.

Upon entry of the amendment Claims 1-7, 15 and 16 will be under active consideration.

The amendments to the claims are supported by the claims as originally filed and on pages 3 and 4 of the specification.

The amendment to the specification is supported on page 11, lines 10-12 and page 12, lines 5-7 of the specification.

No new matter has been added by the amendments.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Miggins for the helpful and courteous discussion he had with Applicants' U.S. Representative on August 31, 2005. At that time, Applicants' U.S. Representative noted the differences between the presently claimed radiation shielding material and the cited references. Specifically, Applicants' U.S. Representative noted that JP-56005371A does not teach or suggest the limitation of at least one metallic material in the described composition, and therefore, the presently claimed radiation shielding material would not have been anticipated or obvious over JP-56005371A. The Examiner agreed this limitation is not present in JP-56005371A, and accordingly, Applicants' respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over JP-56005371A.

In addition, Applicants U.S. Representative noted that there is no motivation to combine McKaveny (U.S. 4,197,218) with JP 52150434, DE 2961602 or Hooper (U.S. 5,740,546) because these references are not directed to a radiation shielding material. The Examiner noted that the claims were not limited to a radiation shielding material, and therefore, the claims as presented were obvious over the cited references. Applicants U.S. Representative suggested amending the claims to limit them to a radiation shielding material or container to more clearly differentiate the claims over the cited references. The Examiner indicated that this amendment would probably overcome the obviousness rejection.

As the Examiner will note, the claims have been amended to a radiation shielding material. Because none of the cited references teach or suggest a radiation shielding material, the claimed radiation shielding material would not have been obvious over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the cited references.

In light of the above remarks contained herein, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)



Donald K. Drummond, Ph.D.
Registration No. 52,834